UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/529,587	04/14/2000	JOHN A. DANE	EPRNT-101XX	2045	
Patent Legal Sta	7590 03/16/200 aff	EXAMINER			
Eastman Kodak	Company		TODD, GREGORY G		
343 State Street Rochester,, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,			2457		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/16/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
09/529,587		DANE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GREGORY G. TODD	2457	

	GREGORY G. TODD	2457				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).					
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 3-5,7,8,10,14-17,19,20,23-25,27,28 and Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>1 30-36</u> .					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	h h afana an an tha data af filing a Nia	4:£ A : 4				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/ARIO ETIENNE/	/G. G. T./					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457	Examiner, Art Unit 2457					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment raises new issue requiring further search and consideration, Such new issue being at least that one or more event host attend an event, along with guests and among them being customers of the photographer, with separate logins for the (one or more?) host and guests having different levels of access.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for reconsideration has been considered, however, Applicant has amended the claims substantially, requiring further search and consideration. Applicant argues new issues haven't been raised and further, that the Examiner suggested such amendments and thus such amendments, since suggested by the Examiner, are now necessary and not presented earlier, however, clearly there has been no prior reference or discussion to an event host being a different entity than the photographer, as well as different levels of access based on separate 'logins'.